UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/624,133	07/21/2003	Theodore W. Rogers	34741-872	8021	
O'MELVENY	7590 04/25/2007 & MYERS LLP	EXAM	INER		
Embarcadero Center West KRAMER, DEAN J					
26th Floor 275 Battery Street San Francisco, CA 94111-3344			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3652		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
· 3 MONTHS 04/25/2007			PAPER		

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(a)
		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/624,133	ROGERS ET AL.
Omice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
The SEALL INC DATE of this security of	Dean J. Kramer	3652
The MAILING DATE of this communication a eriod for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	tn the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rood will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  reply be timely filed  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
atus		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05	5 April 2007.	
	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.
sposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1,4,5,7,8,17-21 and 36-41</u> is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdom 5) ☐ Claim(s) <u>7 and 8</u> is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1,4,5,17-21,36-38,40 and 41</u> is/are 7) ☐ Claim(s) <u>39</u> is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.	•
pplication Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and an applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the sheet of the sh	ccepted or b) objected to he drawing(s) be held in abeyar ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		. •
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a life.	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) ) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)
) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application

ş · · · '

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/5/07 has been entered.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 17, 18, 20, 21, 36-38, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al. (6,116,848) in view of either Zaremsky et al. (4,579,380) or Goumas et al. (4,680,523).

The patent to Thomas et al. shows an end effector comprising a wafer blade (14), a pair of arm assemblies (34) including contact pads (48), means (38,50) for moving the pads, and a real-time force feedback system (56,58) capable of dynamically adjusting the force exerted on a wafer while being gripped between the contact pads (48). The Thomas et al. real-time force feedback system is no specifically disclosed as

generating a signal representative of the actual amount of force being exerted by the contact pads on an edge of a wafer.

Page 3

However, the Zaremsky et al. and Goumas et al. patents show gripping devices having gripping pads with force sensing means incorporated in their gripping jaws. In both of these patents, the force detected at each jaw is sent via an electric signal to a processing means for selectively controlling the output of the motor used to drive the jaws (see col. 7, lines 29-34 of Goumas et al. and col. 5, lines 5-8 of Zaremsky et al.).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a force sensing means on the grippers of the Thomas et al. end effector as taught by either Zaremsky et al. or Goumas et al. so that differently sized wafers could be securely held but not damaged by the moveable gripper arms. In regard to claims 20, 21, 36, and 37, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any well known force sensor, such as a load cell (see member 37 in Zaremsky et al.) or strain gauge, as is commonly used in the robotics art especially since applicant has not specifically disclosed that this particular type of force sensor solves any stated problem or is for any critical purpose.

3. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al. in view of either Zaremsky et al. (4,579,380) or Goumas et al. (4,680,523) as applied to claims 1, 17, 18, 20, 21, 36-38, 40, and 41 above, and further in view of Fossey et al. (5,988,971).

Application/Control Number: 10/624,133 Page 4

Art Unit: 3652

Fossey et al. shows a wafer handling blade including a plurality of capacitance sensors (61,62) for detecting the presence of a wafer without actually contacting the wafer.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide the modified Thomas et al. device, presented supra, with capacitance sensors similar to those shown in the Fossey et al. patent in order to properly orient the resulting gripper arms with respect to a wafer without have to first contact the wafer and possibly damage its surface.

4. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al. in view of either Zaremsky et al. (4,579,380) or Goumas et al. (4,680,523) as applied to claims 1, 3, 17, 18, 20, 21, 36-38, 40, and 41 above, and further in view of Bacchi et al. (6,256,555).

The Bacchi et al. patent shows a wafer handling blade with thru-beam optical sensors (80,82) for accurately detecting the edge of a wafer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide edge sensors similar to those shown in the Bacchi et al. patent on the contact pads of the modified Thomas et al. device as an effective means of sensing the edge of a wafer.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 7 and 8 are allowed.
- 6. Claims 39 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3652

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dean J. Kramer whose telephone number is (571) 272-6926. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon., Tues., Thurs., Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (571) 272-6951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dean J Kramer
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3652

djk 4/23/07